

QUESTION #	QUESTION	REFERENCE	RESPONSE
240	What is the domain of this integration? Code 750 applications (e.g., MIS, as given in RTO 3)? IT services in general? GSFC-wide applications or infrastructure? NASA-wide applications or infrastructure?	Statement of Work Section 1.4 IT Integration and Business Infrastructure Support	In this context, individual domains refers to the Data Center and Applications infrastructure including software and hardware used in support of General IT Services for GSFC and other NASA customers.
241	Is any documentation available for the IT Enterprise Management Environment? What are the goals of the project?	Statement of Work Section 1.4 IT Integration and Business Infrastructure Support	The IT Enterprise Management Environment project has not started. The current project overview is provided in the "ITCD Project List for GITISS 092214.pptx" artifact in the solicitation library. The project is anticipated to include process improvement, deployment of new tools, and an improved IT operating capability across multiple independent groups. Some elements of the considered scope may be integrated into the forthcoming NASA approach to implementing the Federal Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigations (CDM) program.
242	Regarding the Enterprise Test Environment (ETE): The draft RFP contained the wording “Develop, host, and manage the Enterprise Test Environment (ETE) ...”. This was changed in the final RFP to be “The contractor shall, host and manage the Enterprise Test Environment (ETE) ...” - i.e., the word “Develop” was deleted. However, in the Answers to Questions Part 2, #60, the Government’s Response begins, “The ETE does not exist today and is to be developed as part of the scope of RTO #3.... ”	Enclosure 3, RTO 3	The ETE has been confused with the Container. The word "Develop" should be added thus making the statement correct. See revised RTO 3.
243	Reference: L.24.1 states that “The offeror shall include Contract Attachment M as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal.” Please provide definition for “model contract” as used in this section. Question: Section L does not identify “Contract Volume” as a required proposal volume. Please clarify the volume in which Attachment M is to be included.	L.13.“General Instructions”, 2nd paragraph	Contract Attachment L is excluded from Mission Suitability page count limitation and shall be included in the Offer Volume.
244	The GITISS RFP does not seem to require a model contract and has an “Offer Volume” rather than the “Contract Volume”. Could the Government please confirm that Attachment L should be submitted in the Offer Volume (as opposed to the Mission Suitability Volume)?	L.13 GSFC 52.215-210 MISSION SUITABILITY VOLUME INSTRUCTIONS (COMPETITIVE) (MAY 2014), Paragraph 1. General Instructions	See response to question 243
245	The offeror shall include Contract Attachment L as part of the model contract in the Contract Volume of their proposal. Would the Government consider excluding Contractor Proposed Enhancements from page count as it is considered an Attachment?	L.13.1 Para 2 pg 74	See response to question 243

246	<p>In the SOW 1.3 there is some duplication. Reference:</p> <p>d. Implement and maintain processes for proactively identifying, researching, and recommending new technologies and capabilities that will eliminate duplication, increase organizational efficiency, improve customer satisfaction, and capitalize on industry best practices. This is a subset of content in item f:</p> <p>e. Provide comprehensive analytical support to determine requirements for new and existing systems, capabilities and business processes. Implement and maintain processes for proactively researching, identifying and recommending new technologies and capabilities that will eliminate duplication, increase organizational efficiency, increase customer satisfaction and capitalize on industry best practices.</p> <p><b>Question:</b> as the Section L instructions direct that the contractor must respond in the order the requirements are listed, would the government please consider reviewing this SOW section and removing subsection D and therefore remove the duplication so that the contractors respond in the government's preferred order.</p>	SOW 1.3 IT Administration	"D" has been removed from section 1.3 of the SOW. See revised Attachment A Statement of Work.
247	If we choose to use a Senior Level staff position as part of the Offeror Management and Administrative Hours/Costs, should we remove the hours from the GPM-Specified Non-Management ONSITE Direct Labor Hours/Costs?	Enclosure A Government Position Descriptions" High Intermediate and Senior level staff positions may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions (i.e., Junior, Low Intermediate, Intermediate). Hours associated with those responsibilities shall be accounted under the Management and Administrative Labor exhibit."	No. The GPM-Specified Non-Management ONSITE Direct Labor Hours should not be reduced as they are considered to be essential to perform task orders under this contract. Higher lever positions, may be assigned to provide oversight and training responsibilities for the lower level positions. However, hours associated with those responsibilities shall be accounted for under the Management and Administrative Hours/Costs Section of Exhibit 1A.
248	It appears that SOW pg. 5 1.3c-e: SOW requirement 1.3e is a copy of the combined 1.3c and 1.3d. Please revise the SOW to eliminate the duplication.	SOW	"D" has been removed from section 1.3 of the SOW.
249	Please clarify the relevance of Small Business Subcontracting Plan Goals for this procurement since GITISS is a small business 8(a) set aside. Request removal of this question and related questions 26-27.	Exhibit 12 General Performance Survey question 25	There are no subcontracting plans goals for this procurement. Not Rated (N/R) may be circled for this response.
250	Personnel requirements will depend on task orders. What list of personnel is expected in Exhibit 4?	L.14.2(h)/Exhibit 4	Exhibit 4 should list the Offeror's plans to obtain personnel, including the total number of staff proposed for each position, how many are available from within the company, and how many will be newly hired for the first contract year.
251	Can the govt. clarify that we do not need to provide the dollar value/cost per hour for fringe benefits in the Mission Suitability volume and just need to provide the cost information in the Exhibit 10 of the Cost Volume.	L.13.3 Total Compensation Plan (Page 77	That is correct. Offerors shall provide the dollar value/cost per hour for fringe benefits in Exhibit 10 of the Cost Volume.

252	The technical approach shall address Sections 1.3-1.7 of the SOW. Where, if anywhere, should the proposal address Section 2.0 (IDIQ Support) of the SOW? Will the requirements of Section 2.0 be evaluated anywhere, if not addressed specifically in the Mission Suitability volume?	L.13, page 75	Offerors shall address only Sections 1.3 – 1.7 of the SOW and the RTO's for Subfactor A. Section 2.0 of the SOW will not be evaluated.
253	Will there be at least 2 weeks between the time answers to RFP questions are published and the proposal due date?		Upon the release of this Q&A, the proposal due date was amended to March 13, 2015 at 3:00 pm.
254	We would appreciate having 14 days to the proposal due date after release of the answers to the questions.		Upon the release of this Q&A, the proposal due date was amended to March 13, 2015 at 3:00 pm.
255	Is the Government able to provide a forecast of when the answers to the questions submitted for the subject solicitation will be available? As it stands, our Pricing Management team is unable to move forward with finalizing our proposal until we receive clarifications from the Government.		The Government cannot provide an exact timeframe when responses will be released however responses are being released as soon as the are developed and reviewed.
256	It appears that the corresponding date in Block 9 of the SF33 still reflects a due date of January 27, 2015 for past performance questionnaire submittal. Please advise if the SF 33 will be amended to reflect the new proposal due date of February 6, 2015.		Upon the release of this Q&A, the proposal due date was amended to March 13, 2015 at 3:00 pm.
257	. Can you please advise as to when answers to questions will be released or if an amendment extending the proposal due date will be issued.		The Government cannot provide an exact timeframe when responses will be released however responses are being released as soon as the are developed and reviewed.
258	We requests for you to supply the date when you anticipate releasing Questions and Answers on the Final Request for Proposals (RFP) for the NASA GITISS procurement, RFP #NNG14475415R. Our team requires answers to critical questions in order to complete our proposal and to ensure that it is compliant.		The Government cannot provide an exact timeframe when responses will be released however responses are being released as soon as the are developed and reviewed.
259	While we are preparing to respond to the GITISS RFP response we quickly wanted to touch base and find out if there will be additional set of Q&A's?		Yes there will be an additional set of questions until all industry questions submitted are responded to.
260	Can you please advise as to when the next round of questions and responses will be released or if an amendment extending the proposal due date will be issued.		The Government cannot provide an exact timeframe when responses will be released however responses are being released as soon as the are developed and reviewed.
261	Regarding Question# 75: The Government's response included modifying the qualifications of Technical Writer IV to reflect 10-12 years of experience, yet the qualifications for Technical Writer V is 10+ years. Is it the Government's intention to modify the Technical Writer V qualifications to reflect 12+ years?		Technical Writer V years of experience was modified to 13 plus years of experience

262	Question & Answer #63, 64 and 65: The government's response included modifying the qualifications of (1) Project Administrator II to reflect BS degree and 1-3 years of experience; (2) Project Administrator III to reflect BS degree and 6+ years of experience; and (3) Project Administrator IV to reflect BS degree with 8+ years of experience. There is now a gap for 4-6 years of experience. Is it the Government's intention to change the qualifications of one or more of these labor category qualifications to cover the gap of 4-6 years of experience?		Years of experience for the Project Manger II and IV has been revised. See revised Enclosure A
263	The subject question states: "Is there any Offsite Labor associated with this contract" Answer is: "No, there is no Offsite labor associated with the contract". However, in the Government RFP Cost Volume Instructions, L.14.2(c), for Cost Proposal Format, page 83, it states "For evaluation purposes, all Management and Administration Costs shall be assumed Offsite". Please confirm that the government intends the Offerors to propose any, if applicable, Management and Administration Labor Cost Offsite.	Amendment 003 Questions and Answers released on February 6, 2015, Question 210/194 (Offsite Labor)	That is correct. Offerors should propose all Management and Administrative costs offsite. There is no offsite direct labor associated with the GITISS contract.
264	With the extension of the proposal due date to February 27, 2015, is the deadline for submitting the past performance questionnaires to the Government extended accordingly?		The deadline for past performance questionnaires is extended to no later than the closing date of this solicitation.